

**Draft Summary of Cultural Resources Work Group Meeting  
Oroville Facilities Relicensing (FERC Project No. 2100)  
March 19, 2002**

The Department of Water Resources (DWR) hosted the Cultural Resources Work Group meeting on March 19, 2002 in Oroville.

A summary of the discussion, decisions made, and action items is provided below. This summary is not intended to be a transcript, analysis of the meeting, or to indicate agreement or disagreement with any of the items summarized, except where expressly stated. The intent is to present a summary for interested parties who could not attend the meeting. The following are attachments to this summary.

Attachment 1	Meeting Agenda
Attachment 2	Meeting Attendees
Attachment 3	Flip Chart Notes
Attachment 4	February 2002 Update
Attachment 5	Sample Cultural Resource Management Plan Table of Contents
Attachment 6	2002 Meeting Schedule
Attachment 7	Interim Recreation Projects Presentation

**Introduction**

Attendees were welcomed to the Cultural Resources Work Group meeting and objectives were discussed. The meeting agenda and a list of meeting attendees and their affiliations are appended to this summary as Attachments 1 and 2, respectively. Meeting flip chart notes are included as Attachment 3.

**Action Items – January 29, 2001 Cultural Resources Work Group Meeting**

A summary of the January 29, 2001 Cultural Resources Work Group meeting is posted on the project web site. The Facilitator reviewed the status of action items from that meeting as follows:

<b>Action Item #C36:</b> Status:	Provide Interim Recreation Project presentation to Cultural Work Group. Dale Hoffman-Floerke, DWR will give Interim Recreation Projects presentation at tonight's meeting.
<b>Action Item #C37:</b> Status:	Distribute a summary update in lieu of February Cultural Resources Work Group meeting. Janis Offermann, DWR Resource Area Manager reported that she distributed a February update to Work Group participants via mail. Additional copies are available at tonight's meeting and included as Attachment 4 to this summary.
<b>Action Item #C38:</b> Status:	Distribute Table of Contents for sample Management Plan. A sample Table of Contents for a Management Plan was distributed by DWR with the draft agenda on March 6. Additional copies were available at tonight's meeting and included as Attachment 5 to this summary.
<b>Action Item #39:</b> Status:	Revise schedule to ensure Cultural Resources Work Group meetings are held on Tuesdays only. The Facilitator distributed a revised 2002 Collaborative Process meeting schedule, indicating all Cultural Resources Work Group meetings are on Tuesdays. See Attachment 6.

### **Interim Recreation Projects Presentation**

Dale Hoffman-Floerke from the DWR explained that a Task Force (formed from the Recreation and Socioeconomics Work Group) evaluated an initial listing of about 200 possible recreation projects. The Task Force developed criteria to filter and rank the possible projects, and developed a list of 23 Interim Recreation Projects that are, for the most part, enhancements of existing facilities. She explained that depending on the amount of engineering and/or environmental work that would be necessary to implement the projects, they were divided into Categories I, II, III, or IV. She reviewed the list of projects, and distributed a handout of her presentation (Attachment 7).

Art Angle asked how Proposition 40 funding would affect the Interim Recreation Projects. Dale Hoffman-Floerke responded that she did not know if money within the legislation was specifically allocated to local projects in Oroville. Michael Pierce representing Butte County explained that the Joint Powers Authority (JPA) has applied for funding from three of the four categories for Prop 40 funds: Reservoir Improvements (5 million dollar request), River Parkway (8 million dollar request), and Historical and Cultural funds (3 million dollar request).

Dale concluded her presentation on the Interim Recreation Projects by explaining that the CEQA process for the interim projects is separate from the relicensing process and the projects were screened to select projects that are not expected to require a lengthy environmental review process. The Facilitator added that the projects were also screened to avoid modification to the existing license.

### **Study Plan Implementation Update**

The Facilitator reported that the Plenary Group has reviewed over 50 study plans thus far, of which 43 have been approved. She explained that during Plenary Group review of SP- C1, the State Water Contractors (SWC) raised a 'heartburn' issue over what 100% survey of the fluctuation zone meant. The Plenary Group decided that SWC and DWR needed to talk to FERC to come to consensus, after which the Plenary Group would approve the study plan. That conversation took place and the complete set of Cultural Resources study plans have been approved by the Plenary Group.

Art Angle asked the FERC representative to explain the definition of 100% coverage. Frank Winchell, with FERC, responded that 100% meant that they would consider the entire Area of Potential Effects (APE) and focus intensive pedestrian surveys on heavily impacted areas within the APE – as well as areas that have a high chance of cultural resource occurrence, such as flat areas. Frank noted that variables such as steep slope are routinely factored into the inventory strategy. He also explained that additional sampling of areas that could be indirectly affected by project activities would occur.

### ***Native American Employee Training***

Janis Offermann reviewed the planned training for tribal members who will be employed to assist with the field and office work necessary to complete Study Plan C1. The first half-day training session will begin Saturday, March 23, 2002 at 9am with an orientation and presentation of the various positions available. The training will take place at the new Cultural Resources office located at 2128 Meyers Street in Oroville. Janis suggested that interested persons could apply for positions with the Tribal Legacy Coordinators. The Tribal Legacy Coordinators provided their new telephone and fax numbers. These are included on Attachment 3. Further training will occur the week of April 8, with fieldwork targeted to begin April 15, 2002.

One participant asked about land ownership issues. Steve Heipel noted that the GIS group is continuing to collect and incorporate more refined information, but that there is still work to be done to finalize state and federal ownership status. Kevin McCormick from the Plumas National Forest

explained that he was going over files at the Forest for easement issues related to the Forest Service lands.

### **Maidu Advisory Council Update**

Art Angle provided an update on the Maidu Advisory Council (MAC). He explained that he was not at the last meeting in February, but would review the meeting minutes for the Work Group. Artifact security was discussed at the Advisory Council meeting. The Council agreed that artifacts are to be retained at the Oroville Cultural Resources office, under Native American control, with acknowledgment that a few specimens might temporarily be sent away for specialized studies. Final protocols regarding artifact collection and storage between tribes and the consulting team are near completion. He announced that preliminary site inspections around the fluctuation zone are to be conducted by CSU Sacramento consulting team members and the Tribal Legacy Coordinators. He also announced that they were developing monthly reports to the Mooretown Tribal office for contract purposes.

Leslie Steidl asked about protocols with the MAC as they might relate to excavations at historic-era sites or the collection/curation of historic artifacts. Frank Winchell responded that the legislation and regulations were clear that Native American interests were of most concern in relationship to sites with traditional and sacred values. Mark Selverston with the consulting team responded that there would be no collection of historic resources during the inventory, and that they expected to be able to gather necessary data by documenting diagnostic information in the field. Leslie Steidl with Department of Parks and Recreation suggested that if the existing permit needs to be re-submitted to allow for the collection of prehistoric artifacts, the process could take longer than they expect. Mark explained that they will be working with DPR to acquire a revised permit to allow for limited collection of prehistoric diagnostic artifacts.

### **Next Meeting and Next Steps**

Janis Offermann proposed that the next two scheduled Cultural Resources Work Group meetings be replaced with written summaries of activities occurring related to the start of fieldwork. The summaries will be mailed to the Cultural Resources Work Group participants. She proposed the next Cultural Resources Work Group meeting be held in June. The group concurred. The next Cultural Resources Work Group meeting will be:

Date: June 18, 2002  
Time: 5:30 – 9:30 p.m.  
Location: To be determined

### **Action Items**

The following list of action items identified by the Cultural Resources Work Group includes a description of the action, the participant responsible for the action, and due date.

<b>Action Item #C40:</b>	Research information on possible Proposition 40 funding for activities at Oroville.
<b>Responsible:</b>	DWR Staff
<b>Due Date:</b>	May 2002
<b>Action Item #C41:</b>	Distribute Work Group summaries for April and May.
<b>Responsible:</b>	DWR
<b>Due Date:</b>	April 30; May 30